



APPL. NO. 10/642,817

Applicant Bruce Forsberg

Date: January 23, 2006

Appl. No. 10/642,817

Filed 8/19/2003

Title: Candle wick maintenance instrument

Honorable Commissioner for Patents

Washington DC 20231

Sir,

Thank you for your resent reconsideration of this patent application. It is an unfortunate decision to deny a viable patent based upon a receipt date that is 9 days past a 1 month expedited submittal date that was arbitrarily assigned by the government. The applicant understands the workload imposed at the USPTO and accepts that review processes are quit lengthy and did not request an expedited application process. If the government intended to take action in 30 days, the expedited response date would be understandable. However, no subsequent action was taken until almost 6 months after the expedited delivery due date. This indicates the response was received 173 day ahead of the actual review date. It is difficult to understand how a small delay on the part of documentation receipt has adversely impacted the ability of the government to perform their function when the response was received well ahead of the actual review date.

I understand the difference between laws, rules, regulations, policies, procedures, and guidelines and the application of good common sense. Thomas Jefferson would be proud of the evolution of the patenting process in denying viable claims based upon over-consumption of slack time in a review process. In return for the moneys provided to apply for a patent and revive a patent, I have received a valuable education in Government bureaucracy. Thank you for this learning opportunity.

No funding has been included for consideration as for no response is requested or required.

Respectfully,

Bruce Forsberg